

K. Synge (4)

THE

# Bishop of RAPHO's SECOND LETTER,

Written upon Occasion of two BOOKS lately  
Published against him.

S I R,

**A**LTHO' for very good Reasons, and with the Approbation of all Men with whom I have discoursed upon the Subject; I have taken up a Resolution, which I believe I shall not alter, never to Read, and much less to Answer, those Books which my Lord Bishop of *Cork* has been pleased to publish against me; Yet shall I not in the least decline to give you all reasonable Satisfaction in those particulars wherein you seem to desire it.

It was upon a *Sunday*, about the middle of *May* last, that his Lordship meeting me at a Funeral, was pleased to ask me when I intended to begin my Journey to *Rapho*; I told him not till *Munday* come Se'night at the soonest: And upon the *Friday* following, in the Evening, a little ragged Boy brought me the Answer which he had published to my Letter, and meeting me accidentally at my Door, gave it into my Hand, and went immediately away, without speaking one word, as far as I can remember.

Being at that time preparing for my Journey; Which could not be put off, because it was to attend my Lord Primate's Triennial Visitation, I really had not leisure to read above three or four pages of the Book: But by them I presently found that the bare publication of my Letter would, to all sober Men, be a sufficient Reply to it: And being told by one, into whose Hands I gave it, that this was what his Lordship demanded from me, I the next Day writ the short Account which I have prefixed to my Letter, and straitway ordered it to be sent to the Press.

Being obliged not only to be at his Grace's Visitation, but also soon after to travel almost round the Diocese of *Rapho*; you may believe that, during the time I was Abroad, I had but little Opportunity to study or write; and indeed the Account which every one, who had read his Lordship's Book, gave me of the Temper and Manner of its Composition, confirmed me more and more in my Opinion, that no sober and impartial Man would think that it needed any Reply at all: And therefore from the Day that I received it, to this present Time, I never read one Word more of it, than what I have already told you.

As to my *Sermon* which I was forced to print in the Beginning of *October*, 1714: His Lordship and I had, very soon after, a little, and but a little Discourse about it; In which the strange Notion of *Parts* neither *Essential* nor *Integral*, but only *Circumstantial* or *Accidental*, upon which he then grounded his great Objection against it, appearing to me to have nothing of Weight or Solidity in it, I could not imagine that ever I should have heard any more of that Matter from him: Nor indeed do I know (except a very little by hear-say) what the Contents of this his last Book are. For he has not thought fit to favour me with a Copy; And by the Account which all others, that I meet with, give of it, I see no Reason why I should so much as read it.

But you tell me that his Lordship has set my Arguments in a *Diverting Light*. How this is performed I am not much concerned; Nor is it any difficult Matter for an ingenious Man (who will venture to take such a Liberty) by dextrous Misconstructions, mixed with obscure Terms, a few Jest, and personal Reflections, so to *divert* and turn away the Mind of an unwary Reader, as that he shall not easily attend to, or observe the true and exact State of a Controversy. But if instead of a *Diverting Light*, which is very apt to dazzle the Sight, you will be so kind, or rather *just*, as to set what I have said in my former Letter in a *calm and true Light*; You will find that *St. Paul's* Objection (for indeed I borrowed it from him) against his Lordship's Doctrine about drinking to the Memory of *K. William*, is not to be answered. Bring all the Syllogisms and obscure Terms you can together, yet will you never be able to prove any Action to be a *Sin*, except you point out some *Law of God*, of which it is a *Transgression*. And indeed if both *St. Paul* and *St. John* had been silent in this Matter; Yet every sober Man's own Reason would be sufficient to inform him, that *Sin* is nothing else but the *Transgression of the Law*, 1 John 3. 4. And that *where no Law is there is no Transgression*, Rom. 4. 15.

If therefore instead of *Diverting*, you have a Desire to *inform* your self; search the *Law of God* both natural and revealed, with all the Diligence



Diligence you can, and try if you can there find it either expressly, or by just Consequence *forbidden*, for a Man to drink a Glass of Wine, *as a customary Sign or Token of his Sincerity*, when he wishes any thing, whatever it be, that is Lawful. For upon this, and this alone, the Resolution of the Case must intirely depend, when the Question is whether This or that Thing be a *Sin*.

You seem to think that I have given his Lordship some very great Provocation; Or else he who once professed such an intire Friendship to me, would never have treated me after so unkind a Manner. I once indeed thought my self happy in his Lordship's Friendship, and as a sincere Friend, dissuaded him all I could from publishing a Doctrine, which to me both then did, and still does appear to be not only erroneous, but really and truly an *adding* to the Law of God; Nor am I able to find out wherein such *Addition* consists. (As it is forbidden, *Deut. 4. 2.* and elsewhere) except it be in maintaining that to be a *Duty* or a *Sin* which God himself has not any Way made so: And when I could not prevail with his Lordship, even so much as to take the Advice of any one Bishop concerning his new Notion, before he published it; I freely, yet modestly, told him, that he neither had nor could prove his Point, as long as the two Texts of Scripture which I have but now quoted, were allowed to be of Force, and at his own Desire in writing gave him my Reasons for what I said; neither was I shy in common Conversation of owning that I was of a different Opinion from his Lordship. If this be a *Provocation* that deserves such high Resentment, I must own that I gave it: But beyond this, I profess I know not what Reason his Lordship has to be offended with me: And if he pleases to inform me, and I am guilty, I shall be ready to beg his Pardon; As I believe you think he ought to do mine, if he has wronged me.

But you tell me that in my printed Letter I have given his Lordship *harsh Language*, that I charge him with using *hard or ambiguous Words, Terms of Art, and intricate Reasonings*: And do you call Truth fairly exprest, and without any Aggravation, *harsh Language*? If *Sin* is the *Transgression of the Law* (As the Holy Spirit of God by St. *John* has told us) Whosoever would impartially enquire whether any Action be really a *Sin*, ought to fix upon some Law of God whereby to make a Tryal; and, having truly stated the Intent or *Will of God* in making that Law, as also the *true Nature or Import of the Action*, of which the Enquiry is to be made, must then fairly examine whether there be any thing in that *Action* that is any Way contrary to the Design of that Law. But instead of this fair and clear Way of proceeding, his Lordship has, first, changed the very Terms of the Question. His first Book

is

is entitled, *Of drinking to the Memory of the Dead*; his *second Part* (As he calls it) is *of drinking in Remembrance of the Dead*. Now I pray Sir consider; is not *drinking to the Memory* one thing, and *drinking in Remembrance* (As we do of Christ in the blessed Sacrament) quite another? Did any Man ever drink *to the Memory* of Christ? Or *in Remembrance* of K. William? Or if his Lordship, contrary to the Sense of all Men, will call it drinking *in Remembrance* of K. William; Will he say that this Expression [*in Remembrance*] has the same Signification upon both Occasions? And if not; Is not this a manifest Imposition upon his Reader by the meer *Ambiguity* of the Words? Or wherein does such Ambiguity consist, but in this, that one and the same Word or Expression, either is sometimes used, or at least may be wrested and strained to different Significations?

Again, has his Lordship any where stated and cleared up the Design and Intent of any *particular Law of God*, as a Rule whereby we may bring this Action of *drinking*, &c. to a fair Tryal? Or has he impartially enquired into the *Nature and Import of the Action* it self, and plainly shewn what it is that Men do when they so drink? Whether he has done any thing of this Sort in his Answer to my Letter, I neither know nor intend to enquire. But in his *first and second Part*, wherein this ought to have been fully done, All that I can find, which seems to look that Way, to me appears so obscure and involved, that with Respect to my self, I must call it dark and *intricate*; Nor do I believe that it will appear much clearer to any Reader of a common Capacity: And as for *Essential Form, Sacramental Action us'd Un sacramentally*, and some other Words which his Lordship uses, and sometimes lays a Stress upon, what are they but *Terms of Art*, or Artificial Expressions? Which, altho' being well explained, they may be of good Use among Scholars, or others that are sufficiently accustomed to their Meaning; yet to those who are Strangers to them, are no better than an Amusement; and much more apt to perplex than inform their Consciences, without some better Explication be given of them, than any which his Lordship seems to me to have advanced.

At least you think it very harsh that I should charge his Lordship's Doctrine with *Blasphemy*: If this were so (as I am sure it is not) we are but upon equal Terms: For his Lordship has charged that Practice, which (Abstracting from Abuses) I have defended, with no less than *Idolatry*. But I pray consider: One Man having a right Notion of the blessed Sacrament, has at the same time a very wrong one of the Practice of drinking to the Memory of K. William, and for this Reason calls these two Actions *the same*. This indeed is a great, and perhaps



an *uncharitable Mistake*, and the very utmost that I any Way lay to his Lordship's Charge : But another may ( and is by me supposed to ) have a right Notion of the Practice of drinking to the Memory of K. William, but a wrong one of the blessed Sacrament ; And if, on this Supposition, he affirms that *the Action of drinking in the holy Communion, instituted by Christ, is the same, or of the same sort with that customary one of drinking to K. William's Memory* ; I then indeed say that he is guilty of *Blasphemy* ( which is defined to be a *speaking contumeliously of God or his Ordinances* ). But as this is far from being his Lordship's Case ; so I cannot but wonder that a Man of your Sense could not presently perceive that he is no way concerned in that Passage of my Letter.

But you seem to put a bitter Construction upon those Words of my Letter, wherein I say, that *If his Lordship cannot find a Difference between that Action of drinking in Remembrance of a Person departed this World, which is applied to Christ in the holy Sacrament, and that which [In quite another Manner] is applied to K. William (As he professes, Part 2. Page 29.) I cannot but admire what is become of that Accuracy of Thought, which I have so often had Occasion to observe in him.* I solemnly profess that the last Sentence of this Clause was by me designed as a Token of Honour and Respect to him ; And as such ( and no otherwise ) was particularly taken Notice of by some of those few Friends whose Opinion I desired of what I had written. I have often both with Profit and Delight taken Notice of the Accuracy of his Lordship's Thoughts in several Instances, which I then intended, and shall always be ready to acknowledge ; Nor had I then the least Thought of signifying any more but my Wonder that a Person of so good a Judgment in other Things, should be so much mistaken in this : Or if I had had any Apprehension that my Words would have been so uncharitably wrested to what I never meant by them, as I find they have been ; I would have taken the utmost Care I could to have prevented such a Misconstruction.

You object to me that there having been so great a Friendship between his Lordship and me, I ought not to have communicated my Letter to any one before I had shewed it to him. But I pray consider that at first I communicated my Thoughts with all Privacy to his Lordship ; But after the Publication of his first Book, and that the Matter of it became a common Subject of Discourse ; I had Occasion many times in ordinary Conversation to give my Opinion of his grand Assertion with Reference to Conscience : Which whenever I did, I always built upon this Foundation, That I could by no Means yield

B

any

any Action to be a *Sin*, until I saw it sufficiently proved so (not barely by Metaphysical Terms, or Syllogisms, but from the plain and clear Design of the *Law of God*; and for what I said I frequently quoted the two remarkable Texts already mentioned. When therefore (Page 51 of his 2. Part) I found his Lordship advancing a very wrong Interpretation of St. *Paul's* Words as by me quoted (*Rom. 4. 15.*) as it by *no Law* in that Place, were only meant *no express positive Law*; Whereas I had always affirmed to him that the *Design of the Law*, tho' not *expressed*, was there also intended, And (Page 53, Marg.) After a *large Answer* just given, I was soon to expect a *full* one also to my *Objection*, wherein the *shameful Weakness* of it was without Mercy to be exposed; I thought it best not only to review and farther enlarge upon what I had offered, but also to take the Opinion privately of some Friends both of his Lordship's and mine upon it, that I might either make it appear to be of real Force, or else retract it, if I found it to be Weak and Unconclusive. For this Reason I shewed what I had written, to a few Persons of the best Character, before I gave it to his Lordship. But when his Lordship himself, without so much as asking any Consent of mine, was pleased to tell me that he had given Liberty to others to take Copies of it; I believe you will easily allow that, after that, I was not under the least Obligation to keep it any longer concealed.

But if I had a Mind effectually to confute his Lordship's Doctrine, you think I ought to have given an Answer to his *Syllogisms*, at least to that *strictly Categorick* one (Part 2. Page 40.) In which he seems to have collected his whole Strength: For he assures us that *the Matter of it is so evident, that from the Time* his Adversaries begin to consider seriously (which hitherto then it seems they never had done) *it will sting their Consciences, it will stick by them to their dying Day, and not leave them any Quiet in their Minds, till their Recantation is as publick as the Opposition they have given to the Doctrine it proves.*

Had his Lordship first established his Point by any one solid and sufficient Argument clearly proposed; and, having thus both enlightned and convinced the Judgment of his Reader, had then proceeded collaterally to enforce what he had said, by the Considerations of a disturbed Conscience, and a Death-bed; I for my part, should highly have approved of it. But when I find a Man first beginning to raise Fear and Terror in the Mind (which always disturbs the Reason) before he offers to produce his Proof; It gives me a great Suspicion of the Weakness of his Cause: Nor is there any thing more unfair in the common Way of Disputation which is used by the Romish Priests, than this,



this, That they first affright, and thereby unsettle the Minds of poor ignorant People, by confidently pronouncing Damnation to them, if they do not become *Catholicks*, as they call it ; And when they have thus shaken them by working upon their Imagination ; Then they come upon them with their fallacious Arguments.

But let us hear the Syllogism, which I shall set down at large, and fill up an *Ec.* which his Lordship has put into his Conclusion, that we may the better be able to make a right Judgment of it. It runs thus,

*No Action which by Command or Institution of Christ is made a part of Divine Worship, can, without Idolatry, be applied to a meer Man.*

*But that Action of Drinking in remembrance of a Person departed this World, is by Command and Institution of Christ, made a part of Divine Worship. Therefore*

*That Action of Drinking in Remembrance of a Person departed this World ( Which last Words are supplied by an *Ec.* ) cannot without Idolatry be applied to a meer Man.*

I profess I do not see any thing in this Syllogism, but what, in my former Letter, I think I have sufficiently Answered, or Obviated : However ; I shall not think much of a few Minutes pains to take it into a little farther Consideration.

If any of the *terms* made use of in a Syllogism are either of doubtful Signification, and not sufficiently Explained, or are used in Senses not *exactly* the same in the several Propositions of it ; Such a Syllogism, However seemingly exact in the sound of its Words, cannot determinately conclude any thing.

First then, *Person departed this World*, in this Syllogism, neither is, nor with Truth can be taken in the same Signification in the *Conclusion* as it is in the *Minor* of it. In one it is put to signify the *single* Person of Jesus Christ *alone*, Whereas in the other it is put to denote a Person *in general*, as comprehending the Person of *King William*, or any other Man departed this World. And if, instead of an *Ec.* His Lordship had express'd his *Conclusion* at length, This diversity of Signification would more obviously have appeared to every intelligent Reader.

Secondly, This expression *in remembrance*, has a very different signification in the *Minor* from what it is intended to have in the *Conclusion*. In the former, it necessarily denotes that *only peculiar Commemoration of Christ, as dying for the Sins of Mankind*, which he has appointed to be made in the Holy Sacrament ; But in the latter it is designed to take in the memory of *K. William* ; Or any other Person whatever ; Which is quite another sort of a thing.

And here again we may observe that His Lordship not only in his Title  
Pages,

Pages, but also in the Body of his Arguments, has changed those very terms in which all the force of them, If they had any, is alone to be placed. In his first Syllogism (Pt. 1. p. 11.) He tells us that *Christ has appropriated drinking to the Memory of the Dead to his own Person*: By which (As the preceding proposition shews) He means not the *bare expression* (Which is none of Christ's) but the *action* signified by it: But in the Syllogism now under Consideration, Instead of the words *to the memory of the Dead*, He substitutes, *in remembrance of a Person departed this World*: Which to the imagination of the Reader presents a very different Idea of the Action about which the Dispute is, and thereby not only *perplexes*, but indeed *alters* the state of the Question. For altho' *that action of drinking in remembrance of a Person departed this World, which by Command and Institution of Christ is made a part of Divine Worship*, ought not to be applied to any but Christ himself, who died for our Sins; Yet the action of drinking a Glass of Wine, in our common Entertainments as *a token of our sincerity*, when we wish well to the success of a Cause, to the Health and Prosperity of a living Friend, or the Glorious Memory of K. Wm. who is deceased (which action is *not made a part of Divine Worship*, but only of *Civil Respect*, And that by Custom) cannot by his Lordships Argument be proved to be any way sinful or unlawful.

From the bare *sound* of words no consequence can be drawn, but must always be inferred from the *meaning*, or signification of them: Nor was there any Man, I believe, before my Lord Bishop of *Cork*, that ever used this expression *drinking to the Memory*, as applied to K. Wm. in the same signification as that of *drinking in Remembrance*, when applied to Christ: And if, contrary to Custom, and the Sense of all other Men, his Lordship will apply both of these expressions indifferently to each of those Actions; Yet as long as it still *must* be with different Meanings, it cannot from thence be inferred that the Things or Actions, are the same. For the farther clearing up of which, gave me leave to transcribe a part of the first Paper which I gave his Lordship.

“ St. Paul first most labouriously preached the Gospel, and then laid  
 “ down his Life for it. Therefore it is lawful while the World stands,  
 “ to keep up an honourable Remembrance of him. But he did not dye  
 “ for us, as Christ did: And therefore it is altogether unlawful, as well  
 “ as absurd, to have *such a remembrance of him* as we have of Christ,  
 “ altho' without eating or drinking in token of it. But to eat and drink,  
 “ That is, to keep a Festival Day, as one means of keeping up such a  
 “ remembrance of him (and other good Men) as in it self is proper  
 “ and lawful, is forbidden by no Law of God, and therefore no Sin.

“ Suppose



“ Suppose then that every Year, upon *St. Paul's-Day*, I should first  
 “ go to Church, and there partake of the *Holy Communion* : And then  
 “ invite my Neighbours to Dinner, Telling them that I did this on pur-  
 “ pose that by keeping up the Memory of *St. Paul*, I might put them  
 “ all in mind of that thankfulness which is due to God for the great be-  
 “ nefits he has vouchsafed unto us by his [ i. e. *St. Paul's* ] Preaching,  
 “ Writing and Suffering : Would it not be plain that, in this case, my  
 “ eating and drinking at Church, in remembrance of Christ, and my  
 “ eating and drinking afterwards at Home, in a manner as different as  
 “ may be, and for the keeping up such a remembrance of *St. Paul* as is  
 “ in it self both lawful and commendable ; Would it not be plain, I say,  
 “ that these two Actions, As to their *Moral Nature* ( Whereby alone  
 “ we are to judge of their Lawfulness ) would be very different one  
 “ from the other ? And because they *may* be brought under *one com-*  
 “ *mon Form of Expression*, and one of them *called* eating and drinking  
 “ *in Remembrance of Christ*, and the other eating and drinking *in Re-*  
 “ *membrance of St. Paul*, must this Agreement in one Expression ( Altho'  
 “ the things signified by it are vastly different ) makes us infer that  
 “ therefore the actions are of the very same Nature ? This were to form  
 “ our Judgment according to the bare *sound* of words, and not their true  
 “ *import* or *signification*, or the *nature of the things* which they de-  
 “ note unto us.

In a word ; If in imitation of the Blessed Sacrament, any one should  
 affect to use this particular expression [ *in remembrance* ] in any com-  
 mon or ordinary Drinking ; Or if, with or without drinking, he should  
 offer so to commemorate any *other person* whatever, as we are bound to  
 do *our blessed Saviour* ; Both these things, I grant, would be in the  
 highest degree sinful ; Nor have I yet ever heard of any Man so wicked,  
 or indeed *mad*, as to do either of them : But *in common Conversation*,  
*to drink a Glass of Wine as a customary token of my sincerity, when I*  
*wish well to the Memory of King William*, being neither expressly, nor  
 by consequence, forbidden by any law of God that I can find, is, in my  
 opinion, no sin, except by being abused to some ill purpose, it becomes so.

But supposing his Lordship to have been mistaken in his Opinion, yet  
 still you demand what harm would it have been if he could any way  
 have prevailed with Men to lay aside a practice that by some has already  
 been abused, and may perhaps hereafter prove the occasion of evil, more  
 than it has already done ? And therefore what necessity was there that  
 I should at all interpose in the Matter ?

How I came first to speak, Then to write, and at last to publish any  
 thing in this Controversy, I have already given, I think, a fair Account,

in what I have prefixed to my former Letter. And indeed if the question had only been whether, *in Prudence*, Men should have continued or forborn the custom of drinking to the Memory of K. *Wm.* Or if his Lordships Arguments had only been levelled against the *abuse* either of that, or any other practice, he should from me have had no opposition; But when a common practice, For Eleven Years together, not at all thought sinful by any Man, that I ever heard of, is on a sudden charged, first, as a Profanation of the Holy Communion, and soon after as no less than *Idolatry*; And this Charge grounded upon Principles which are not only wrong, but also, in their Consequences, likely to perplex and misguide weak Minds in other Matters as well as this: No Man sure is to be blamed, who in a fair and sober way endeavours first, if he can, to prevent the publication of such Mistakes, or afterwards to confute them, and thereby wipe off the reproach either of gross Ignorance, or great Wickedness, that must in consequence lye upon the Clergy as well as Laity, if they should be received for Truths.

As to my Sermon preached *Octob. 3. 1714.* ( With some passages whereof you seem not thoroughly satisfied ) Give me leave to inform you that as soon as I heard that a very false Interpretation both of it, and my design in it, was spread about the Town; I carefully and faithfully recollected and writ it down while it was fresh in my memory; And the next *Sunday* made a full repetition of that part of it, against which some had taken offence, before I sent it to the Press; And I do now challenge ( As long since I often did ) any one who heard it, to assign any one passage in the whole, that I have either added, omitted, or altered; Of which if you are not able to produce even one single instance, Is it fair or just in you to suggest ( As you do ) that in my printed Sermon I have concealed or varied in any thing from what I Preached?

As soon as it was published, I gave it to several Persons of Learning, Piety, and intire Affection to our Established Church; Who expressly told me that it was altogether conformable to our Churches Doctrine: Nor have I yet heard of any one, Besides your self and my Lord Bishop of *Cork*, that made any other Objection to it, after they had read it; Except some that seemed to think it a little unreasonable ( Tho' why it should be thought so I cannot yet see ) And a few others were of opinion that, pag. 15. l. 6. Instead of *may be obliged*, I ought to have said *are obliged*: Of which I leave you to judge, if you please but thoroughly to consider the Connexion of that with the preceding Paragraph.

I grant you indeed that there is a [ notional or imaginary ] Difference between our *attainment of eternal Salvation*, and our *promoting the Glory of God*: But are not these two things, *practically considered*,



considered, and in a religious Sense, altogether the same? Or have you any other Way of glorifying God, but only by doing those things which tend to your Salvation? When therefore from my Text I lay down this Observation, That *the only End and Design, which each Man ought to propose to himself in his Religion, is the attainment of everlasting Life, or eternal Salvation*; Can you have so little Charity as to suggest, or in the least to imagine, that this is to be (Or indeed can be) understood as exclusive, or not inclusive of *the Glory of God*? St. Paul (no doubt) expressly requires that we should *do all to the Glory of God*, 1 Cor. 10. 31. But does not our Saviour as plainly tell us, that the Act of *glorifying God* consists in the doing those very things which he requires from us, in order to our own Salvation? *Herein is my Father glorified that ye bear much Fruit*, Joh. 15. 8. I have indeed, in that Sermon, set the innocent Satisfaction of this Life, and the Happiness of the next, in a due Contradistinction one to the other: But as for *pleasing God*, and *glorifying God*; Both the general Drift of the Discourse, and in some Places the express Words of it, do plainly shew, that I lookt upon them to be the very same thing with *pursuing our own Salvation*; Or (which with Reference to practical Religion is all one) that they were so joined together as not to be separated. See Page 7. l. ult. and p. 9. l. 14.

But altho' [in Practice] these two things are really but one and the same; And he who truly designs and does the one, must of necessity as truly design and do the other also; Yet [in Speculation, and when we are discoursing of the *End of Religion*] you think a Distinction ought to be made between them, and both of them expressly named. I will not at Present dispute this Point with you? But supposing that my Expressions were not as full and distinct, as it is manifest my Meaning was honest and good; Yet the same Apology which my Lord Bishop of Cork makes for some Defects of Expression in his first Book, which he knew before-hand would meet with Opposition, may as well serve for my Sermon, which I did not imagine would meet with any. I will set down his Lordship's own Words (Part 2. p. 9.) And leave you to accommodate the *Purport* of them to my Case, as far as you think proper; Only at the same time assuring you that whatever may appear over-sharp in them, is not by me in the least intended for you, or any other Person.

" 'Tis your narrow superficial Heads, who, not being able to see thro'  
 " a Subject, are gravel'd with every *seeming* inconsistency; And at e-  
 " very thing they can't reconcile, make a great outcry of *Nonsense* and  
 " *Contradiction*: Tho' they labour only to pervert a Man's Words, and  
 " wrest

“ wrest his Sentences to a Meaning never in any ones Head but their  
 “ own : And tho’ they neither see nor touch the stress of the Argu-  
 “ ment, yet never fail to boast loudly that they have knock’d a Man  
 “ down, when they have been only paring his Hair or Nails. ( N. B. )  
 “ All Controversy necessarily supposes something of Candour and Sincerity  
 “ in an Adversary ; And in many Cases a Man must express himself  
 “ short to avoid tedious repetitions ; And nothing can be more disingenuous  
 “ than to strain all that to Inconsistence and Contradiction, which  
 “ a fair Reader will plainly see was only to save him a trouble, by putting  
 “ the Argument in the *shortest* and clearest Light.

Of what I have said in my *Sermon*, touching the *Ceremonies* of our Church, I shall offer no other Defence, but to desire you to compare it ( Which I am sure you have not yet carefully done ) not only with our 34th Article, and Preface to the Common-Prayer, which I quoted in the Margin, But also, with any of the allowed Writers of our Church on that Subject, and particularly Bishop *Sanderfon*’s large Preface to his *Sermons* : Nor have I said any thing on this Occasion, but what long since I had more largely done ( and that with the Approbation of my Superiors ) in divers small Books or Pamphlets, which at several times I have published, and am ready to shew you, if you have not already troubled your self to look into them. Particularly be pleased to consult my *Defence of the Established Church and Laws*, Pag. 96. &c. And *A true Churchman*, &c. from page 6. to page 19. Which last little Pamphlet I gave to his Lordship in 1709. I writ two more against the *Dissenters*, all agreeing in the same Doctrine with this Part of my Sermon ; But it being long before ; It is probable that they are now forgotten ; and therefore I name them not.

But you tell me that I am *fundamentally wrong* in asserting that our Established Ceremonies are *not Parts*, but only *Circumstances of Religion* : Whereas you would have it, that altho’ they are not *essential*, nor *integral*, yet still they are to be look’t upon as *Circumstantial Parts* of it. Must I then trifle with you about the *Metaphysical* Notions of *Totum* and *Parts* ? Consult all the Philosophers who have written on the Subject, And you will find by them, that altho’ you may take as many things as you please of different sorts to make up, in your own imagination, a *Totum heterogeneum*, or *aggregatum* : Yet *Totum* and *Parts* being always *Relative Terms*, and every *Part* being to be conceived as an *Ingredient* to constitute or make up the *Whole* ; Whatever is conceived as a *Part*, i. e. as an *Ingredient* of any *Totum*, cannot at the same time be conceived as *Circumstantial*, i. e. *external* to it. So that *A circumstantial Part of a thing*, whatever it be, is as plain a Contradiction



tradition in the very Terms, as can possibly be imagined. The Difference between a *Part* and a *Circumstance* (which are very common Words) is easy to be apprehended by every Man who understands the Language: But a *circumstantial Part* (i. e. an *external Ingredient*) is to me a Sound without a Signification; As a *round Square*, an *oval Cube*, or any other two inconsistent Terms, so put together would be.

If you will have me go on to act the Part of a young Collegian; *Circumstantial* is a *Denominative* from *Circumstance*; Which your own *Burgersdicius* thus defines, *Circumstantia est quod Circa rem est, eive adjacet, aut appositum est*, Log. L. 1. C. 19. If this be a good Definition (As I believe you will not deny it to be) Tell me plainly is it possible for any *Thing* to have a *circumstantial Part*? But let me tell you, that when these empty *Philosophick Speculations*, which are only fit to whet the Wits of Boys, are brought in to perplex the Affairs of Religion; Then they become such *vain Babblings and Oppositions of Science falsely so called*, as St. Paul expressly directs to be avoided, 1 Tim. 6. 20. Or if by a *circumstantial Part* you mean no other than what I do by a *Circumstance*; Which perhaps may be the Case; Is not this that very *striving about Words* against which the same Apostle so sharply expresses himself, 1 Tim. 6. 4. and 2 Tim. 2. 14.

If you please but once more to consider the last Inference, and what follows to the End of my Sermon; You will easily see that there is not one Word there, that in the least relates to the *Ceremonies* of our Church, but the whole is levelled against that vast Number of unnecessary *Controversies* which have been mixed with Religion, by those who seem more to have aimed at a vain Ostentation of their own Wit and Subtily, than the true Satisfaction of Mens Consciences, or the directing them in the Way of everlasting Salvation: These, and these only are the *Trifles* which there I compare to *Atalanta's Apples*; And as for the Marginal Quotation at the Bottom of Page 15. which perhaps misled you, your Eye will soon inform you that it is to be joined with the like in the foregoing Page, where the *Ceremonies* are spoken of.

But you seem to object even against my poor *Faculty of Preaching*, and tell me I know not what, of *sanctified Cant*, and *chewing the spiritual Food until it becomes nauseous*, or somewhat to this Purpose; which you say my Lord Bishop of Cork intends for me, in his Answer to my Letter. But sure his Lordship is a better Christian than to endeavour to defeat what little Good I may be able to do, by rendring my Preaching contemptible. He did me the Favour to appoint me to Preach at his Consecration; and was pleased particularly to commend the only Sermon which since that time I remember him to have heard from me: But

D

however

however that is or may be ; I will take Care to make the best Use of the Hint you give me, and for the Time to come, to do better than formerly I have done.

But still it is suspected that in that Sermon I had some secret Design to the Prejudice of our Church ; And the Reason of this Suspicion you give me in his Lordship's own Words ; Whereby at the Beginning of his Book, he endeavours to get Possession of the Mind of his Reader. *Viz.*

" When this Sermon was first Preached, 'tis said there happened  
" a great Concourse of Dissenters, who are *immoderately* bent a-  
" gainst our Episcopacy, Confirmation, Liturgy, Rites, Ceremonies,  
" and Articles, &c. As also of such who have but a *Moderate, very*  
" *Moderate*, Degree of Zeal and Concern for them, *i. e.* for the whole  
" Constitution of that Church of which they are visible Members, and  
" in the Communion of which they hope for Salvation.

" I need not tell you with what secret Pleasure, Which disclosed it  
" self with Applause in their Looks, these received the agreeable Do-  
"ctrine, whilst the true and genuine Sons of the Established Church were  
" filled with Grief of Heart. Their Countenances fell, and discovered  
" that Surprise and just Indignation, which became a sincere and firm  
" Adherence to that Profession they were first received into by Baptism --  
Thus far his Lordship's Words as you set them down.

Whether the Dissenters are thus *bent* not only *against our Episcopacy, Confirmation, Liturgy, Rites, Ceremonies* ; but also against all, or any other thing contained in our *Thirty Nine Articles* ( For what the following, &c. Means I know not ) Let them answer for themselves : But all the things that are here suggested against the Congregation which then was at Church, or against me or my Sermon, However pompously expressed, are really no more but Oratorical Fictions.

For, First, No Man but my self either had or could have the least Knowledge or Apprehension what particular Points I intended to handle ? And therefore it is very improbable that that Day, above all others, there should be so *great a Concourse* at my Parish-Church : Nor, I assure you, was the Congregation then greater than at other Times it generally used to be.

Secondly, If there had been any Number of *Dissenters* that Day at Church, In all likelihood I should soon have heard something of it ; Especially so great a Noise about my Sermon having the very next Day been made. Whereas I profess solemnly, that until I heard of this Passage in his Lordship's Book ; The least Mention of any such Thing was never made that I know of. Nor have I any Reason to believe that there  
was



was so much as one *Dissenter* at that time present : Or if there were, I cannot imagine what *Pleasure* it could be to him, to hear the great Objection of his Party against our Ceremonies plainly confuted.

Thirdly, As for the Congregation then present, which his Lordship calls a *Concourse* ; It consisted ( For as much as ever I could learn, or then observe ) only of the Parishoners, and some few that had been so, with perhaps a very small Number of Lodgers or others, who sometimes used to come thither. And as for the then or late Parishoners ; I who then had been for above Eight Years their Pastor, can assure you, that they deserve a much better Character than what his Lordship has been pleased to bestow upon them.

And, Lastly, All this pretended *Applause disclosing it self in the Looks of some ; And Grief of Heart with Surprise and Indignation discovered in the fallen Countenances of others*, is no more but a meer Flourish. For there was not the least visible Emotion in the Congregation all the while I was Preaching : Nor was it possible for any one to observe such various Alteration of Countenance ( If any such there had been ) in the several Persons who in a [supposed] *great Concourse* were met in that Church, which is none of the most Lightsome, and in a dusky Evening ; Except he had gone round from Pew to Pew to peep Mens Faces, Which I need not assure you that no Man did.

But if the Sermon I Preached, were the same that I have Printed ( For which I always have, and still do appeal to those who heard it ) And if it also be exactly agreeable to the Doctrine of our Church ( For which I again appeal to our Articles, Book of Common-Prayer, and approved Writers, particularly Bishop *Sander son* ) How came it at first to be so misconstrued, and even still to be opposed by my Lord Bishop of *Cork* ? To which I shall return you no other Answer but this, that Mistakes and Misapprehensions have often arisen from different Causes, and been propagated upon different Motives ; Of the Particulars of which, in this present Case, I shall not take upon me to give you any Account, but leave you intirely to your own Conjectures.

I will add no more but to tell you that if Bishop *Sander son's* Preface ( And I may add his Sermons *Ad Clerum* ) do not sufficiently satisfy you of the Truth of my Doctrine touching our Ceremonies : You may consult Bishop *Beveridge's* Exposition of our Twentieth Article ; With a Quotation from whence I will conclude this Letter.

“ It is lawful for the Church to decree and appoint what Rites or  
 “ Ceremonies shall be used in the publick Worship of God ; Not as  
 “ Parts of that Worship ; For then they would not be Rites and Cere-  
 “ monies. And therefore it is in vain objected by the Adversaries to

" this Truth, that herein we give the Church Power to add any thing  
 " to God's Worship, which is not commanded in his Word ; As if  
 " Rites and Ceremonies were in themselves any *Part* of Worship.  
 " Whereas what is any *Part* of God's Worship cannot be a meer Rite  
 " or Ceremony ; Neither can that which is a meer Rite or Ceremony  
 " be any *Part* of his Worship. For Rites and Ceremonies, in that  
 " they are nothing but Rites and Ceremonies, be in themselves indiffe-  
 " rent, neither Good nor Bad, until determined by the Church ; after  
 " which Determination also they still remain indifferent in themselves,  
 " and are Good and Bad only in Reference to their Decree, who had  
 " Power and Authority to determine them. Whereas every the least  
 " *Part* of God's Worship, in that it is a *Part* of God's Worship, can  
 " by no Means be omitted without Sin. And therefore when it is here  
 " said, that the Church has Power to decree Rites or Ceremonies, we  
 " must always by the Words Rites or Ceremonies, understand *nothing*  
 " *else* but the particular *Circumstances* and Customs to be observed  
 " in the Service and Worship of God, not as any Cause or *Part*  
 " thereof.

I am Your, &c.

Dec. 22. 1715.

F I N I S.

6 DE 58

Page 6. { Line 2. read Metaphysical.  
 { Line 29. read Sting.

Page 11. Line 35. dele at.

